arXiv:1410.2712v2 [math.FA] 14 Oct 2015

POSTORDER REARRANGEMENT OPERATORS

JOHANNA PENTEKER

Abstract. We investigate the rearrangement of the Haar system induced by the postorder on the set of dyadic intervals in $[0,1]$ with length greater than or equal to 2^{-N}. By means of operator norms on BMO_N we prove that the postorder has maximal distance to the usual lexicographic order.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{D}_N$ be the set of dyadic intervals in $[0,1]$ with length greater than or equal to 2^{-N}. Let τ be any bijective map on $\mathcal{D}_N$ and $(h_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}_N}$ the L^∞-normalised Haar system. On the space BMO_N we consider rearrangements of the Haar system induced by the map τ:

$$T_\tau : h_I \to h_{\tau(I)}.$$

In recent years boundedness criteria and extrapolation properties for rearrangement operators that rearrange the Haar system have been studied in detail. See, [20, 21, 19, 13, 6, 5, 15, 7].

In the present work we complement the cited papers by investigating in detail one particular rearrangement and its extremal nature. We introduce the *postorder*, $\preceq$, on the set of dyadic intervals $\mathcal{D}_N$.

Definition. Let $I, J \in \mathcal{D}_N$. We say $I \preceq J$ if either I and J are disjoint and I is to the left of J, or I is contained in J.

This specific order defines a bijective map τ_N on the set $\mathcal{D}_N$, called the *postorder rearrangement*, that maps the n^{th} interval in postorder onto the n^{th} interval in lexicographic order. Its inverse is denoted by σ_N.

We show that the postorder has maximal distance to the usual lexicographic order on $\mathcal{D}_N$. We quantify the distance by the product of operator norms

$$\|T_{\tau_N} : \mathrm{BMO}_N \to \mathrm{BMO}_N\| \|T_{\sigma_N} : \mathrm{BMO}_N \to \mathrm{BMO}_N\|.$$

Particularly, we prove that within a factor of $\sqrt{2}$, on BMO_N, both the operator T_{τ_N} and its inverse T_{σ_N} reach maximal norm. We denote

$$R^N(\mathrm{BMO}_N) = \sup\Big\{\|T_\tau \colon \mathrm{BMO}_N \to \mathrm{BMO}_N\| : \tau \colon \mathcal{D}_N \to \mathcal{D}_N \text{ bijective}\Big\}.$$

Our main result is

Theorem. For $T = T_{\tau_N}$ and $T = T_{\sigma_N}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} R^N(\mathrm{BMO}_N) \le \|T\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \le R^N(\mathrm{BMO}_N).$$

Date: October 15, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 47B38 42B30 30H35 46B70 60G42; Secondary: 68P05 68P10.

This continuous the previous study of [17], who determine from a different perspective the extremal nature of the postorder and the induced rearrangement. P.F.X. Müller and G. Schechtman show that any block basis of the Haar system $(h_I)_{I\in\mathcal{D}_N}$ with respect to the postorder, $\preceq$, spans spaces that are well isomorphic to ℓ_k^p, $1 < p \neq 2 < \infty$. On the other hand it is easy to find block bases of the Haar system with respect to the lexicographic order (the Rademacher functions) whose span is well isomorphic to ℓ_k^2.

The postorder has its origin in computer sciences (see e.g. [1, 8]). In computer sciences, especially in the design and analysis of algorithms, dyadic trees are commonly used data structures, which enable efficient access to data. Tree traversal algorithms, which systematically walk through a tree and visit each node exactly once, enhance this efficient access. These algorithms define a specific order on the nodes of a tree. This makes it possible to talk about the node following or preceding a given one. The postorder tree traversal visits the left child, then the right child and then the node itself. Considering the dyadic tree structure of $\mathcal{D}_N$ this traversal induces exactly the postorder, $\preceq$, on $\mathcal{D}_N$. The postorder tree traversal is for example used in the mergesort algorithm, invented by von Neumann in 1945. A more basic application is deallocating memory of all nodes of a tree, i.e. deleting a tree. In calculator programs the postorder tree traversal is used to evaluate postfix notation.

The Mallat algorithm for discrete wavelet transform (DWT) (see [10, 11]) determines the wavelet coefficients of a given discrete signal in a specific order which works its way up from the finest level to the coarsest. In case of the Haar transform this order is exactly our postorder, $\preceq$, cf. figure 1. We discuss the discrete Haar wavelet transform (see e.g. [22]) now in detail. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Suppose a discrete sig-



FIGURE 1. Calculation of the trend (c_k^j) and the fluctuation (d_k^j) for $0 \le j \le 3$.

nal on $[0, 1]$ is given by the sequence $c^N = (c_1^N, \dots c_{2^{N-1}}^N)$. We process the signal by decomposing it into its trend (approximating coefficients) c^{N-1} and its fluctuation (detail coefficients) d^{N-1}:

$$c_k^{N-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(c_{2k}^N + c_{2k+1}^N\right) \quad \text{and} \quad d_k^{N-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(c_{2k}^N - c_{2k+1}^N\right).$$

The trend and the fluctuation are two subsignals of c^N with half of its length. The signal c^{N-1} is again decomposed into its trend c^{N-2} and its fluctuation d^{N-2}, which are again subsignals of c^{N-1} with half of its length. Successively we compute from c^j the trends c^{j-1} and the fluctuations d^{j-1}. Finally, after N steps, we have decomposed the signal c^N into the coarsest information c_0^0 and the detail coefficients $(d^j)_{j=0}^{N-1}$, where $d^j = (d_0^j, \dots, d_{2^j-1}^j)$.

The Haar system is the most basic orthonormal wavelet basis used in DWT and gives insight in more sophisticated wavelet transforms.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper we will denote by $\mathbb{N}$ the set of positive integers and by $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ the set of non-negative integers.

Unless stated otherwise: ℓ, k, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $0 \le \ell \le N$ and $0 \le k \le 2^{\ell-1}$.

2.1. Floor and ceiling function.

The *floor function* $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{Z}$ and the *ceiling function* $\lceil \cdot \rceil : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{Z}$ are defined as follows:

$$\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{z \in \mathbb{Z} : z \le x\}, \quad \lceil x \rceil = \min\{z \in \mathbb{Z} : z \ge x\}.$$

2.2. Dyadic intervals and trees.

Dyadic intervals. An interval $I \subseteq [0,1]$ is called a *dyadic interval*, if there exist non-negative integers ℓ and k with $0 \le k \le 2^\ell - 1$ such that

$$I = I_{\ell,k} = \left[\frac{k}{2^\ell}, \frac{k+1}{2^\ell} \right[.$$

The length of a dyadic interval $I_{\ell,k}$ is given by $|I_{\ell,k}| = 2^{-\ell}$. In the following we consider for fixed $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the set of dyadic intervals with length greater than or equal to 2^{-N} given by

$$\mathcal{D}_N = \{I_{\ell,k} : 0 \le \ell \le N,\, 0 \le k \le 2^\ell - 1\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Carleson constant. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_N$. We define the Carleson constant of $\mathcal{C}$ as follows

$$[\![\mathcal{C}]\!] = \sup_{I \in \mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{|I|} \sum_{J \subseteq I, J \in \mathcal{C}} |J|. \tag{2.2}$$

If $\mathcal{C}$ is non-empty, then $[\![\mathcal{C}]\!] \ge 1$, otherwise $[\![\mathcal{C}]\!] = 0$.

Dyadic trees. See [1, 8]. A *dyadic tree* $\mathcal{T}$ consists of a set of nodes that is either empty or has the following properties:

(1) One of the nodes, say R, is designated the root node.
(2) The remaining nodes (if any) are partitioned into two disjoint subsets, called the left subtree and the right subtree, respectively, each of which is a dyadic tree.

The definition yields that every node of a tree is the root of some subtree contained in the tree $\mathcal{T}$. The root of the left resp. the right subtree described in property (2) is called the *left child* resp. *the right child* of the root R. Conversely, the root R is called the *parent* of the left (resp. right) child. We use the terminology of family trees: parent, children, descendant, etc. The nodes of a dyadic tree $\mathcal{T}$ can be partitioned into disjoint sets, called *levels*, depending on the length ℓ of the unique path from a node to the root R. The root R is at level 0. The *lowermost*

level of $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of nodes, whose unique path from the node to the root $\mathcal{R}$ has maximal length within the tree $\mathcal{T}$. The *depth* of $\mathcal{T}$ is the number of levels in $\mathcal{T}$ that do not contain the root R. A dyadic tree $\mathcal{T}$ is *complete*, if every node in $\mathcal{T}$ has exactly two children, except the nodes in the lowermost level, which have exactly zero children, cf. figure 2. In the following we consider complete dyadic trees of depth N, $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The number of nodes in each level ℓ, $0 \leq \ell \leq N$, is given by 2^ℓ and the total number of nodes in a complete dyadic tree of depth N is given by $2^{N+1} - 1$.

The complete dyadic tree $\mathcal{D}_N$. The set $\mathcal{D}_N$, given by equation (2.1), has a natural dyadic tree structure, cf. figure 2. The root of the complete dyadic tree $\mathcal{D}_N$ is the



FIGURE 2. The dyadic tree structure of $\mathcal{D}_4$.

dyadic interval $I_{0,0}$. The depth of $\mathcal{D}_N$ is equal to N. For an interval $I_{\ell,k} \in \mathcal{D}_N$ the index ℓ denotes its level within the tree and k its position within the level. The left resp. the right child of an interval $I_{\ell,k} \in \mathcal{D}_N$ is given by

$$I_{\ell+1,2k} = \left[\frac{2k}{2^{\ell+1}}, \frac{2k+1}{2^{\ell+1}}\right[\quad \text{resp.} \quad I_{\ell+1,2k+1} = \left[\frac{2k+1}{2^{\ell+1}}, \frac{2\,(k+1)}{2^{\ell+1}}\right[. \tag{2.3}$$

Dyadic subtrees. Let $I_{\ell,k} \in \mathcal{D}_N$. We denote by $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}$ the complete dyadic subtree of $\mathcal{D}_N$ with root $I_{\ell,k}$ and depth $N - \ell$. Note that $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k} = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I \subseteq I_{\ell,k}\}$. Therefore, we get from (2.2) the Carleson constant

$$[\![\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}]\!] = \frac{1}{|I_{\ell,k}|} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}} |I| = N - \ell + 1. \tag{2.4}$$

2.3. **The order on $\mathcal{D}_N$.** See [17], [1] and [8]. The *postorder* $\preceq$ on $\mathcal{D}_N$ is defined as follows.

Definition 2.1. Let $I, J \in \mathcal{D}_N$. We say $I \preceq J$ if either I and J are disjoint and I is to the left of J, or I is contained in J.

In terms of the dyadic tree structure of $\mathcal{D}_N$ the postorder is defined as follows: children are always smaller than their parent, the left child is always smaller than the right child and smaller than the descendants of the right child, cf. figure 5.

The natural order on the set $\mathcal{D}_N$ is the *lexicographic order*, $\leq_l$, on the set $\{(\ell, k)\}$. The postorder on $\mathcal{D}_N$, in contrast to the lexicographic order depends on the depth N. The postorder works its way up from the leftmost node in the lowermost level to the root of the dyadic tree $\mathcal{D}_N$. Therefore, it is clear from the definition that the root of the dyadic tree $\mathcal{D}_N$ has postorder ordinal number $2^{N+1} - 1$, which is the total number of nodes contained in the tree $\mathcal{D}_N$.

Observe that $I_{1,0}$ is the left child and $I_{1,1}$ is the right child of the root $I_{0,0}$. Hence, the complete dyadic subtree $\mathcal{T}_{1,0}^N$ resp. $\mathcal{T}_{1,1}^N$ of $\mathcal{D}_N$ is the left resp. right subtree of the root $I_{0,0}$. The definition of the postorder yields that the left subtree contains the ordinal numbers $1, \ldots, 2^N - 1$ and the right subtree the ordinal numbers $2^N, \ldots, 2^{N+1} - 2$.

2.4. **The order intervals.** Let $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{D}_N$. An order interval with respect to the postorder, $\preceq$, is given by

$$\mathcal{B}^N(J_1, J_2) = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : J_1 \preceq I \preceq J_2\}, \tag{2.5}$$

and with respect to the lexicographic order, $\leq_l$, by

$$\mathcal{E}(J_1, J_2) = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : J_1 \leq_l I \leq_l J_2\}. \tag{2.6}$$

The following definition and proposition is taken from [17] and describes order intervals with respect to the postorder, $\preceq$.

Definition 2.2. Let $I, J \in \mathcal{D}_N$ with $I \subseteq J$.

(1) The *cone* $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(I, J)$ of dyadic intervals between I and J is the unique collection of dyadic intervals $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \ldots, C_n\}$, where $n = \log_2 \frac{|J|}{|I|} + 1$, satisfying $C_1 = I$, $C_n = J$, $|C_i| = \frac{1}{2}|C_{i+1}|$ and $C_i \subset C_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

(2) The *right fill-up* of the cone $\mathcal{C}$ is the collection of dyadic intervals $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(I, J) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{U}_{i+1}$, where $\mathcal{U}_{i+1} = \{U \in \mathcal{D}_N : U \subseteq C_{i+1} \setminus C_i\}$, if C_i is the left half of C_{i+1} and $\mathcal{U}_{i+1} = \emptyset$, if C_i is the right half of C_{i+1}.



FIGURE 3. Cone and right fill-up given by the dyadic intervals $I = I_{4,4}$ and $J = I_{1,0}$ in $\mathcal{D}_4$.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and $J_1 \preceq J_2$. For the postorder order interval $B^N(J_1, J_2)$ there exists a unique collection $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, \ldots, L_m\}$ of pairwise disjoint dyadic intervals satisfying*

(1) $|L_i| < |L_{i-1}|$, *if* $2 \le i \le m-1$;
(2) $|L_m| \le |L_{m-1}|$, *if* $m \ge 2$;
(3) L_{i+1} *lies to the right of* L_i *and the closures* $\overline{L_i}$ *and* $\overline{L_{i+1}}$ *intersect in exactly one point, the left endpoint of* $\overline{L_{i+1}}$;
(4) $J_1 \subseteq L_1$, $J_2 = L_m$ *and*

$$\mathcal{B}^N(J_1, J_2) = \mathcal{C}(J_1, L_1) \cup \mathcal{R}(J_1, L_1) \cup_{i=2}^{m} \mathcal{M}_i, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_i = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I \subseteq L_i\}$.

Remark 2.4. Note that the intervals $(L_i)_{i=1}^m$ are the maximal (with respect to inclusion) dyadic intervals in the postorder order interval $B^N(J_1, J_2)$.



FIGURE 4. The postorder order interval $\mathcal{B}^4(I_{4,4}, I_{4,12})$ in $\mathcal{D}_4$.

2.5. **The spaces.**

Haar system and Haar support. We define the L^∞-normalised *Haar system* $(h_I)_{I \in \mathcal{D}_N}$ as follows:

$$h_I = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on the left half of } I, \\ -1 & \text{on the right half of } I, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $(x_I)_{I \in \mathcal{D}_N}$ be a real sequence and let $f = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_N} x_I h_I$. The *Haar support* of f is the set $\{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : x_I \neq 0\}$. The Haar support of f is contained in a non-empty collection of dyadic intervals $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_N$ if and only if $f = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{C}} x_I h_I$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{C})$ the space of all functions f that have Haar support in a non-empty collection $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_N$.

Dyadic BMO$_N$ and the dyadic Hardy spaces H^p_N. We define here the known spaces BMO_N and H^p_N, for fixed $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, (see e.g. [12]). Let $(x_I)_{I \in \mathcal{D}_N}$ be a real sequence and $f = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_N} x_I h_I$. We define

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} = \sup_{I \in \mathcal{D}_N} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \sum_{J \subseteq I} |x_J|^2 |J| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$\|f\|_{H^p} = \|S(f)\|_{L^p([0,1])}, \quad \text{for } 0 < p < \infty,$$

where $S(f)$ is the square function of f defined by

$$S(f)(t) = \Big(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_N} |x_I|^2 1_I(t) \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad t \in [0,1].$$

Then we define the spaces BMO_N and H^p_N, $0 < p < \infty$, as follows

$$\mathrm{BMO}_N = \Big(\operatorname{span} \{h_I : I \in \mathcal{D}_N\}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} \Big)$$

and

$$H^p_N = \Big(\operatorname{span} \{h_I : I \in \mathcal{D}_N\}, \|\cdot\|_{H^p} \Big).$$

Note that BMO_N and H^p_N are finite dimensional subspaces of the dyadic BMO and H^p spaces, defined in [14].

Paley's theorem ([18], see also [14]) asserts that for all $1 < p < \infty$ there exists a constant A_p such that for all $f \in L^p([0,1])$ given by $f = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}} x_I h_I$

$$\frac{1}{A_p} \|f\|_{L^p} \le \|S(f)\|_{L^p} \le A_p \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

This theorem identifies H^q as the dual space of H^p, where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $1 < p < \infty$.

Fefferman's inequality ([3], see also [14])

$$\left| \int f h \right| \le 2\sqrt{2}\, \|f\|_{H^1} \|h\|_{\mathrm{BMO}}, \tag{2.8}$$

and a theorem to the effect that every continuous linear functional $L : H^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ is necessarily of the form $L(f) = \int f\varphi$ with $\|\varphi\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} \le \|L\|$ identify BMO as dual space of H^1, (see [3],[4],[14]).

2.6. **The operators.**

Rearrangements of the Haar system. Let τ be a bijective map defined on the set $\mathcal{D}_N$. On BMO_N we study rearrangements of the L^∞-normalised Haar system $(h_I)_{I \in \mathcal{D}_N}$ given by the rearrangement operator

$$T_\tau \colon h_I \mapsto h_{\tau(I)},$$

and on H^p_N, $0 < p < \infty$, rearrangements of the L^p-normalised Haar system given by the rearrangement operator

$$T_{\tau,p} : \frac{h_I}{|I|^{\frac{1}{p}}} \mapsto \frac{h_{\tau(I)}}{|\tau(I)|^{\frac{1}{p}}}.$$

A standard argument (given below) yields the following norm estimates for rearrangement operators on BMO

$$\sup_{\substack{\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_N \\ \text{non-empty}}} \frac{[\![\tau(\mathcal{C})]\!]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[\![\mathcal{C}]\!]^{\frac{1}{2}}} \le \|T_\tau\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \le (N+1)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.9}$$

Note that the lower bound in (2.9) is always greater than or equal to one.

Let $x = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{D}_N} x_I h_I$. Then

$$\|T_\tau x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}} = \sup_{I\in\mathcal{D}_N} \frac{1}{|I|}\sum_{J\subseteq I} \left|x_{\tau^{-1}(J)}\right|^2 |J| \leq \sup_{I\in\mathcal{D}_N} |x_I|^2 [\![\mathcal{D}_N]\!] \leq \|x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}} [\![\mathcal{D}_N]\!].$$

Definition (2.2) yields $[\![\mathcal{D}_N]\!] = N+1$. Let $\mathcal{C}\subseteq\mathcal{D}_N$ be any non-empty collection of dyadic intervals. Let $x = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}} h_I$. Then

$$\|x\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} = [\![\mathcal{C}]\!]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|T_\tau x\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} = [\![\tau(\mathcal{C})]\!]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Let $x = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{C}} x_I h_I$ for some non-empty collection of dyadic intervals $\mathcal{C}\subseteq\mathcal{D}_N$. The above argument provides the following rough upper bound

$$\|T_\tau x\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} \leq \|x\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} [\![\tau(\mathcal{C})]\!]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.10}$$

The adjoint operator of a rearrangement operator is again a rearrangement operator induced by the inverse rearrangement. By the duality of H^1 and BMO we have that the operator T_τ on BMO_N is the adjoint operator of $T_{\tau^{-1},1}$ on H^1_N with

$$\frac{1}{C_F}\|T_\tau\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \leq \left\|T_{\tau^{-1},1}\right\|_{H^1_N} \leq C_F\|T_\tau\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_N}, \tag{2.11}$$

where $C_F = 2\sqrt{2}$ is the constant appearing in Fefferman's inequality (2.8).

Interpolation and extrapolation of rearrangement operators. See [6, 14]. The following interpolation resp. extrapolation theorem provides a tool that enables one to deduce norm estimates for the rearrangement operators $T_{\tau,p}$ on H^p_N for every $0<p<2$ from norm estimates of some rearrangement operator T_{τ,p_0} on $H^{p_0}_N$, $0<p_0<2$. The left-hand side inequality corresponds to an extrapolation based on Pisier's extrapolation norm (see [6]). The right-hand side inequality is obtained by a standard interpolation argument. Note that $\|T_{\tau,2}\|_{H^2_N} = 1$.

Theorem 2.5. *For all $0<s<r<2$ there exists a constant $c_{r,s}>0$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{c_{r,s}}\|T_{\tau,s}\|^{\frac{s}{2-s}}_{H^s_N} \leq \|T_{\tau,r}\|^{\frac{r}{2-r}}_{H^r_N} \leq c_{r,s}\|T_{\tau,s}\|^{\frac{s}{2-s}}_{H^s_N}.$$

The duality of H^p and H^q, $1<q<2$, $\frac{1}{p}+\frac{1}{q}=1$, gives the following corollary to Theorem 2.5. Recall that the adjoint rearrangement operator on H^p_N coincides with the inverse rearrangement operator on H^q_N.

Corollary 2.6. *For all $2<p<\infty$ there exists a constant c_p such that*

$$\frac{1}{c_p}\|T_{\tau,p}\|_{H^p_N} \leq \left\|T_{\tau^{-1},1}\right\|^{1-\frac{2}{p}}_{H^1_N} \leq c_p\|T_{\tau,p}\|_{H^p_N}.$$

Remark 2.7. Observe that by the above theorem and corollary rearrangement operators $T_{\tau,p}$ on H^p_N, $0<p<\infty$, induced by any bijective map τ acting on $\mathcal{D}_N$, have the norm estimate

$$\|T_{\tau,p}\|_{H^p_N} \leq c_p\,(N+1)^{\left|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}\right|}.$$

3. The main theorem

Let τ_N be the bijective map on the dyadic intervals that associates to the n^{th} interval in postorder the n^{th} interval in lexicographic order, cf. figure 5. This rearrangement is called *postorder rearrangement*. Its inverse, which associates to the n^{th} interval in lexicographic order the n^{th} interval in postorder, is denoted by σ_N.



FIGURE 5. Lexicographic order and postorder of the dyadic tree $\mathcal{D}_4$. Postorder rearrangement τ_4 on $\mathcal{D}_4$ and its inverse σ_4.

The rearrangements τ_N and σ_N induce rearrangement operators on BMO_N and on the H^p_N-spaces. On BMO_N we consider the rearrangement operators

$$T_{\tau_N} : h_I \mapsto h_{\tau_N(I)} \quad \text{and} \quad T_{\sigma_N} : h_I \mapsto h_{\sigma_N(I)}$$

and obtain the following norm estimates for these rearrangement operators applied to functions with Haar support in the sets $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0} = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I \subseteq I_{\ell,0}\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}$. Recall that $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}) = \operatorname{span}\{h_I : I \in \mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}\}$ and $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}) = \operatorname{span}\{h_I : I \in \mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}\}$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 \leq \ell \leq N$. Let $T = T_{\tau_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})}$ or $T = T_{\sigma_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell})}$. Then*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(N-\ell+1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|T\|_{BMO_N} \leq (N-\ell+1)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{3.1}$$

This theorem in combination with the general upper bound in (2.9) reveals the extremal nature of the rearrangements τ_N and σ_N in the sense that for $T = T_{\tau_N}$ resp. $T = T_{\sigma_N}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} R^N(\mathrm{BMO}_N) \leq \|T\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \leq R^N(\mathrm{BMO}_N),$$

where $R^N(\mathrm{BMO}_N) = \sup\Big\{\|T_\tau \colon \mathrm{BMO}_N \to \mathrm{BMO}_N\| : \tau \colon \mathcal{D}_N \to \mathcal{D}_N \text{ bijective}\Big\}$. Obviously, the lower bound in (3.1) is the important one for this result and the statement of Theorem 3.1. The upper bound in (3.1) is the trivial one that originates from the depth (in the sense of dyadic trees) of the sets $\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}$ resp. $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}$.

Theorem 3.2 provides a tool that enables one to gain insight into the rearrangement operators T_{σ_N} applied to spaces of functions with Haar support in a lexicographic order interval. In Theorem 3.1 we have already seen that on the lexicographic order interval $\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}$, for some small ℓ, the operator has very large norm. Theorem 3.2 provides the possibility to determine canonical collections of dyadic intervals on which the rearrangement operator has small norm. The significance of the upper bound in Theorem 3.2 is given by the fact that $\log_2 \frac{1}{|L_1|}$ is able to compensate the term N. In order to obtain the upper bound in Theorem 3.2 we use a geometric representation of order intervals with respect to the postorder, $\preceq$. Hence, one can read off the upper bound from the tree representation of $\mathcal{D}_N$, cf. figure 4.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(E_1, E_2)$ be the lexicographic order interval given by the dyadic intervals $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{D}_N$ with $E_1 \leq_l E_2$. Then*

$$\Big\|T_{\sigma_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})}\Big\|^2_{BMO_N} \leq N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_1|} + 2, \tag{3.2}$$

where L_1 is the maximal (with respect to inclusion) dyadic interval in the postorder order interval $\mathcal{B}^N(\sigma_N(E_1), \sigma_N(E_2))$ that contains the left endpoint $\sigma_N(E_1)$.

Lexicographic order intervals $\mathcal{E}(E_1, E_2)$ with large Carleson constant are given by endpoints E_1, E_2 which satisfy the property that $\log_2 \frac{1}{|E_1|}$ is much smaller than $\log_2 \frac{1}{|E_2|}$. The upper bound in Theorem 3.2 depends for these order intervals only on the right endpoint E_2. Particularly, the upper bound is given by

$$\Big\|T_{\sigma_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})}\Big\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \leq \log_2 \frac{1}{|E_2|} + 2.$$

Note that this upper bound can be obtained by applying Theorem 3.2 to the order interval $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(I_{0,0}, E_2)$.

The duality relation of H^1_N and BMO_N, in particular the norm equivalence in equation (2.11), and the interpolation resp. extrapolation procedure in Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.6 give equivalent norm estimates as in Theorem 3.1 for the rearrangement operators on H^p_N, $0 < p < \infty$, given by

$$T_{\tau_N,p} \colon \frac{h_I}{|I|^{\frac{1}{p}}} \mapsto \frac{h_{\tau_N(I)}}{|\tau_N(I)|^{\frac{1}{p}}} \quad \text{resp.} \quad T_{\sigma_N,p} \colon \frac{h_I}{|I|^{\frac{1}{p}}} \mapsto \frac{h_{\sigma_N(I)}}{|\sigma_N(I)|^{\frac{1}{p}}}.$$

Corollary 3.3. *For all $0 < p < \infty$ there exists a constant C_p such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $0 \le \ell \le N$ and $T = T_{\tau_N,p}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})}$ or $T = T_{\sigma_N,p}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell})}$ the following holds*

$$\frac{2^{-\left|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}\right|}}{C_p}\,(N-\ell+1)^{\left|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}\right|} \le \|T\|_{H^p_N} \le C_p\,(N-\ell+1)^{\left|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}\right|}. \tag{3.3}$$

Remark 3.4. By the convexification method ([9, 2], see also [16] for the concrete specialisation to Hardy spaces) one obtains the same result as in Corollary 3.3 for the more general Triebel-Lizorkin spaces.

Corollary 3.3 gives, considering the general upper bound in Remark 2.7, the same extremality statement for the rearrangement operators $T = T_{\tau_N,p}$ resp. $T = T_{\sigma_N,p}$ on the spaces H^p_N, $0 < p < \infty$. For all $0 < p < \infty$ there exists a constant B_p such that

$$\frac{2^{-\left|\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}\right|}}{B_p}\,R^N(H^p_N) \le \|T\|_{H^p_N} \le R^N(H^p_N),$$

where $R^N(H^p_N) = \sup\Big\{\|T_\tau\colon H^p_N \to H^p_N\| : \tau\colon \mathcal{D}_N \to \mathcal{D}_N \text{ bijective}\Big\}$.

4. Proof of Theorem 3.1

4.1. **Parameters associated with the postorder rearrangement.** For the proof of the main theorem we need formulae that describe the map τ_N precisely. Recall that τ_N maps the n^{th} dyadic interval in postorder onto the n^{th} dyadic interval in lexicographic order. First of all we give formulae that describe the assignment of postorder ordinal numbers and lexicographic ordinal numbers to the dyadic intervals $I_{\ell,k} \in \mathcal{D}_N$. We denote by $a^\ell(k)$ the postorder ordinal number and by $b^\ell(k)$ the lexicographic ordinal number of the dyadic interval $I_{\ell,k}$.

The assignment rule for a lexicographic ordinal number to a dyadic interval $I_{\ell,k}$ is given by

$$b^\ell(k) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} 2^i\right) + k + 1 = 2^\ell + k.$$

We can determine from the ordinal number $b^\ell(k)$ the level ℓ and the position k of the associated interval $I_{\ell,k}$:

$$\ell = \lfloor \log_2 b^\ell(k) \rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad k = b^\ell(k) - 2^\ell. \tag{4.1}$$

The assignment rule for postorder ordinal numbers to the dyadic intervals is more difficult than in the lexicographic case. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with dyadic expansion $j = \sum \epsilon_i\, 2^i$. We define $m(j) = \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \epsilon_i \neq 0\}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $0 \le \ell \le N$ and $0 \le k \le 2^\ell - 1$. The postorder ordinal number of the dyadic interval $I_{\ell,k} \in \mathcal{D}_N$ is given by*

$$a^\ell(k) = (k+1)\,(2^{N-\ell+1} - 1) + \sum_{j=1}^{k} m(j). \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Let $1 \le j \le 2^\ell - 1$ and let

$$t^\ell(j) = a^\ell(j) - a^\ell(j-1) - 1, \tag{4.3}$$

where $a^\ell(j-1)$ and $a^\ell(j)$ are the postorder ordinal numbers of two successive dyadic intervals in level ℓ. This gives the recursive formula $a^\ell(j) = a^\ell(j-1) + t^\ell(j) + 1$ and thereby the assignment rule for the postorder ordinal number:

$$a^\ell(k) = a^\ell(0) + k + \sum_{j=1}^{k} t^\ell(j). \tag{4.4}$$

The definition of the postorder and the dyadic tree structure of $\mathcal{D}_N$ yield

$$a^\ell(0) = 2^{N-\ell+1} - 1, \quad \text{for all } 0 \le \ell \le N. \tag{4.5}$$

In the following we determine a formula for $t^\ell(j)$, $1 \le j \le 2^\ell - 1$. To this end, we give formulae that associate the postorder ordinal number of a dyadic interval with the postorder ordinal number of its parent. We consider the dyadic interval $I_{\ell,k} \in \mathcal{D}_N$ with the postorder ordinal number $a^\ell(k)$ and its children $I_{\ell+1,2k}$ and $I_{\ell+1,2k+1}$ with the postorder ordinal numbers $a^{\ell+1}(2k)$ and $a^{\ell+1}(2k+1)$. By the definition of the postorder we have $a^{\ell+1}(2k) < a^{\ell+1}(2k+1) < a^\ell(k)$. Furthermore, $a^{\ell+1}(2k)$ is smaller and $a^{\ell+1}(2k+1)$ is greater than the ordinal numbers of the descendants of $I_{\ell+1,2k+1}$. The number of descendants of $I_{\ell+1,2k+1}$ is $2^{N-\ell} - 2$. Hence, the definition of the postorder yields the following recursions:

$$a^\ell(k) = a^{\ell+1}(2k+1) + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad a^\ell(k) = a^{\ell+1}(2k) + 2^{N-\ell}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $0 \le \ell \le N$ and $0 \le k \le 2^\ell - 1$. Induction shows that for $1 \le i < \ell$

$$a^{\ell-i}(s-1) = a^\ell(2^i s - 1) + i \quad \text{and} \quad a^{\ell-i}(s) = a^\ell(2^i s) + 2^{N-\ell+1}(2^i - 1), \tag{4.7}$$

where $1 \le s \le 2^{\ell-i} - 1$.

Now we can determine an explicit formula for $t^\ell(j)$. If j is odd, then the formulae in (4.6) yield $a^{\ell-1}\left(\frac{j-1}{2}\right) = a^\ell(j)+1$ and $a^{\ell-1}\left(\frac{j-1}{2}\right) = a^\ell(j-1)+2^{N-\ell+1}$. Therefore, by equation (4.3)

$$t^\ell(j) = 2^{N-\ell+1} - 2, \quad \text{if } j \text{ is odd.}$$

If j is even, then there exists an integer i, $1 \le i < \ell$, given by $i = m(j)$, and an odd integer s, $1 \le s \le 2^{\ell-i} - 1$ such that $j = 2^i s$. Equation (4.3) and the formulae in (4.7) yield

$$\begin{aligned} t^\ell(s2^i) &= a^\ell(2^i s) - a^\ell(2^i s - 1) - 1 \\ &= a^{\ell-i}(s) - 2^{N-\ell+1}(2^i - 1) - a^{\ell-i}(s-1) + i - 1. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Note that s is odd. The formulae in (4.6) yield $a^{\ell-i}(s) = a^{\ell-i-1}\left(\frac{s-1}{2}\right) - 1$ and $a^{\ell-i}(s-1) = a^{\ell-i-1}\left(\frac{s-1}{2}\right) - 2^{N-\ell+i+1}$. Therefore, by equation (4.8) we have

$$t^\ell(s2^i) = 2^{N-\ell+1} - 2 + i.$$

Summarizing the above we have for all $1 \le j \le 2^\ell - 1$

$$t^\ell(j) = m(j) + 2^{N-\ell+1} - 2. \tag{4.9}$$

Note that $m(j) = 0$, if j is odd. Putting this into equation (4.4) yields the statement.

□

Given the ordinal numbers of a dyadic interval with respect to both the postorder and the lexicographic order on $\mathcal{D}_N$ we can describe the postorder rearrangement τ_N as follows. Let $I_{\ell,k} \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and $a^\ell(k)$ the corresponding postorder ordinal number. Let L and K be non-negative integers such that $a^\ell(k) = 2^L + K$. Recall that

$2^L + K$ is the lexicographic ordinal number of the dyadic interval $I_{L,K} \in \mathcal{D}_N$. Then the *postorder rearrangement* τ_N is the bijective map on $\mathcal{D}_N$ that maps the dyadic interval $I_{\ell,k}$ onto the dyadic interval $I_{L,K}$, cf. figure 5.

In the following section we describe the determination of L and K such that $a^\ell(k) = 2^L + K$. In the following we use the notation

$$\mathrm{Level}(a^\ell(k)) = L \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Pos}(a^\ell(k)) = K.$$

According to (4.1) we have

$$\mathrm{Level}(a^\ell(k)) = \lfloor \log_2 (a^\ell(k)) \rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Pos}(a^\ell(k)) = a^\ell(k) - 2^{\mathrm{Level}(a^\ell(k))}. \tag{4.10}$$

The following two Lemmata give formulae for $\mathrm{Level}(a^\ell(k))$ and $\mathrm{Pos}(a^\ell(k))$, which do not involve the postorder ordinal number $a^\ell(k)$ but only the level ℓ and the position k of the corresponding dyadic interval $I_{\ell,k}$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 \le \ell \le N$. For all $0 \le k \le 2^\ell - 1$ we have*

$$\mathrm{Level}(a^\ell(k)) = \lceil \log_2 (k+1) \rceil + N - \ell. \tag{4.11}$$

Proof. The definition of the postorder yields $a^\ell(0) = 2^{N-\ell+1} - 1$. Therefore, by equation (4.10) we have $\mathrm{Level}(a^\ell(0)) = N - \ell$.

Now we show that for all $1 \le s \le \ell$ and for all $2^{s-1} \le k \le 2^s - 1$

$$\mathrm{Level}\,(a^\ell(k)) = s + N - \ell. \tag{4.12}$$

By Lemma 4.1 we have

$$a^\ell(2^{s-1}) = 2^{N-\ell+s} + 2^{N-\ell+1} - 2^{s-1} - 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2^{s-1}} m(j). \tag{4.13}$$

Recall that for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ given by its dyadic expansion $j = \sum \epsilon_i 2^i$ we have $m(j) = \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \epsilon_i \neq 0\}$. Hence, $m(j) = 0$ for all odd integers j. We can split the sum on the right-hand side of equation (4.13) as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{2^{s-1}} m(j) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^{s-2}} m(2j) = \sum_{j_0=1}^{s-1} m(2^{j_0}) + \sum_{j_1=1}^{s-2} \sum_{j_2=1}^{j_1-1} m(2^{j_1} + 2^{j_2}) + \cdots \\ \cdots + \sum_{j_1=1}^{s-2} \cdots \sum_{j_{s-2}=1}^{j_{s-3}-1} m(2^{j_1} + \cdots + 2^{j_{s-2}}).\end{aligned}$$

By definition, $m(2^{j_0}) = j_0$ and $m(2^{j_1} + \cdots + 2^{j_i}) = j_i$ for $2 \le i \le s-2$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{2^{s-1}} m(j) &= \sum_{j_0=1}^{s-1} j_0 + \sum_{j_1=1}^{s-2} \sum_{j_2=1}^{j_1-1} j_2 + \cdots + \sum_{j_1=1}^{s-2} \cdots \sum_{j_{s-2}=1}^{j_{s-3}-1} j_{s-2} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} \binom{s-1}{k} = 2^{s-1} - 1.\end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Putting this into formula (4.13) we get $a^\ell(2^{s-1}) = 2^{N-\ell+1} + 2^{N-\ell+s} - 2$. Lemma 4.1 yields

$$a^\ell(2^s - 1) = 2^{N-\ell+s+1} - 2^s - m(2^s) + \sum_{j=1}^{2^s} m(j).$$

Note that $m(2^s) = s$. By equation (4.14) we have $a^\ell(2^s - 1) = 2^{N-\ell+s+1} - s - 1$. Equation (4.10) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Level}(a^\ell(2^{s-1})) &= \lfloor \log_2 (2^{N-\ell+1} + 2^{N-\ell+s} - 2) \rfloor = N - \ell + s,\\ \text{Level}(a^\ell(2^s - 1)) &= \lfloor \log_2 (2^{N-\ell+1+s} - s - 1) \rfloor = N - \ell + s.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the map $k \mapsto \text{Level}(a^\ell(k))$ is monotonically increasing for all $0 \le k \le 2^\ell - 1$. Therefore, (4.12) is proven.

For $0 \le k \le 2^\ell - 1$ there exists an integer s, $0 \le s \le \ell$ such that $2^{s-1} \le k \le 2^s - 1$. Therefore, we get $s = \lceil \log_2 (k+1) \rceil$ and $\text{Level}(a^\ell(k)) = \lceil \log_2 (k+1) \rceil + N - \ell$. □

The next Lemma describes the determination of $K = \text{Pos}\,(a^\ell(k))$. As stated previously, $\text{Pos}\,(a^\ell(k))$ depends on $L = \text{Level}\,(a^\ell(k))$, which was determined in Lemma 4.2. Recall that for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with dyadic expansion $j = \sum \epsilon_i 2^i$ we have $m(j) = \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} : \epsilon_i \ne 0\}$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 \le \ell \le N$. Then $\text{Pos}(a^\ell(0)) = 2^{N-\ell} - 1$ and for all $0 < k \le 2^\ell - 1$*

$$\text{Pos}(a^\ell(k)) = (k+1)\,(2^{N-\ell+1} - 1) + 2^{L-N+\ell-1} - 2^L - 1 + \sum_{j=2^{L-N+\ell-1}+1}^{k} m(j).$$

Proof. Recall that $a^\ell(0) = 2^{N-\ell+1} - 1$ and $\text{Level}(a^\ell(0)) = N - \ell$. Therefore, by equation (4.10) we have $\text{Pos}(a^\ell(0)) = 2^{N-\ell} - 1$.

Fix $0 < k \le 2^\ell - 1$ and let $L = \text{Level}\,(a^\ell(k))$. Lemma 4.2 yields $\text{Level}\,(a^\ell(j)) = L$, for all $2^{L-N+\ell-1} \le j \le 2^{L-N+\ell} - 1$. Recall from the proof of Lemma 4.1 that $a^\ell(j) = a^\ell(j-1) + 1 + t^\ell(j)$, where $t^\ell(j) = m(j) + 2^{N-\ell+1} - 2$. Hence, by equation (4.10) we have the following recursive formula

$$\text{Pos}\,(a^\ell(j)) = \text{Pos}\,(a^\ell(j-1)) + 1 + t^\ell(j), \quad 2^{L-N+\ell-1} < j \le 2^{L-N+\ell} - 1$$

and therefore,

$$\text{Pos}\,(a^\ell(k)) = \text{Pos}\,(a^\ell(2^{L-N+\ell-1})) + k - 2^{L-N+\ell-1} + \sum_{j=2^{L-N+\ell-1}+1}^{k} t^\ell(j). \tag{4.15}$$

Since $t^\ell(j) = m(j) + 2^{N-\ell+1} - 2$, it follows that

$$\sum_{j=2^{L-N+\ell-1}+1}^{k} t^\ell(j) = k\,(2^{N-\ell+1} - 2) + 2^{L-N+\ell} - 2^L + \sum_{j=2^{L-N+\ell-1}+1}^{k} m(j). \tag{4.16}$$

Lemma 4.1 and equation (4.14) yield $a^\ell(2^{L-N+\ell-1}) = 2^L + 2^{N-\ell+1} - 2$ and by equation (4.10) we have

$$\text{Pos}\,(a^\ell(2^{L-N+\ell-1})) = 2^{N-\ell+1} - 2. \tag{4.17}$$

Putting equation (4.16) and (4.17) into equation (4.15) yields the statement. □

4.2. **Dyadic subtrees and their lowermost level in $\mathcal{D}_N$.** In this section we examine the behaviour of the postorder rearrangement τ_N on complete dyadic subtrees in $\mathcal{D}_N$ given by

$$\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k} = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I \subseteq I_{\ell,k}\} \tag{4.18}$$

and on their lowermost level in $\mathcal{D}_N$ given by

$$\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,k} = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I \subseteq I_{\ell,k},\, |I| = 2^{-N}\}. \tag{4.19}$$

Note that $\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,k}$ is a collection of disjoint dyadic intervals and hence, $[\![\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,k}]\!] = 1$. We know from (2.4) that $[\![\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}]\!] = N - \ell + 1$. We measure the behaviour of the rearrangement by the Carleson constants $[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k})]\!]$ and $[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,k})]\!]$. The following two theorems and the corresponding proofs reveal a remarkable phenomenon of the postorder rearrangement τ_N. A complete dyadic subtree as well as its lowermost level in $\mathcal{D}_N$ is mapped under τ_N onto collections of dyadic intervals with large Carleson constant, if it contains the leftmost interval $I_{N,0}$, cf. Theorem 4.4. Otherwise, it is mapped under τ_N onto a collection of disjoint dyadic intervals of equal length, cf. Theorem 4.7.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 \le \ell \le N$. Then*

$$[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] = N - \ell + 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad [\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] \ge \frac{N-\ell+1}{2}.$$

Proof. Recall that τ_N maps the n^{th} interval in postorder onto the n^{th} interval in lexicographic order. The definition of the postorder yields that the dyadic intervals in $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}$ have the corresponding postorder ordinal numbers $1, \dots, 2^{N-\ell+1} - 1$, cf. Section 2.3. This are exactly the lexicographic ordinal numbers of the dyadic intervals in $\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}$. Hence, $\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}) = \mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}$ and $[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] = N - \ell + 1$.

The lowermost level of $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}$ in $\mathcal{D}_N$ is given by

$$\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0} = \{I_{N,r} : 0 \le r \le 2^{N-\ell} - 1\}.$$

By the description of the postorder rearrangement τ_N in Section 4.1 we have

$$\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0}) = \left\{ I_{L,K} : L = \mathrm{Level}(a^N(r)),\, K = \mathrm{Pos}(a^N(r)),\, 0 \le r \le 2^{N-\ell} - 1 \right\}.$$

We know from Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3 that $\mathrm{Level}\,(a^N(0)) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Pos}\,(a^N(0)) = 0$. Therefore, $I_{0,0} \in \tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})$ and by definition (2.2)

$$[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] \ge \frac{1}{|I_{0,0}|} \sum_{\substack{J \subseteq I_{0,0},\\ J \in \tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})}} |J| = \sum_{J \in \tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})} |J|. \tag{4.20}$$

Note that $\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}$. We split the sum on the right hand side into levels and get

$$[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] \ge \sum_{m=0}^{N-\ell} 2^{-m} |\mathcal{B}(m)|, \tag{4.21}$$

where $\mathcal{B}(m)$ is the set of dyadic intervals in the collection $\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})$ that have length 2^{-m}. We denote by $\mathcal{A}(m)$ the set of postorder ordinal numbers corresponding to $\mathcal{B}(m)$. Then $|\mathcal{B}(m)| = |\mathcal{A}(m)|$ and

$$\mathcal{A}(m) = \{a^N(r) : 0 \le r \le 2^{N-\ell} - 1,\, \mathrm{Level}(a^N(r)) = m\}.$$

Obviously, $|\mathcal{A}(0)| = 1$. By Lemma 4.2 we have $|\mathcal{A}(m)| = 2^{m-1}$ for all $1 \le m \le N-\ell$. Hence,

$$[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] \ge 1 + \sum_{m=1}^{N-\ell} 2^{-1} = \frac{N-\ell}{2} + 1 \ge \frac{N-\ell+1}{2}.$$

□

Remark 4.5. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. An easy computation shows that for $N-1 \leq \ell \leq N$

$$[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] = 1 + \frac{N-\ell}{2}.$$

Obviously, for $0 \leq \ell \leq N-2$ we have the upper bound

$$[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] \leq N - \ell + 1.$$

Conjecture 4.6. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \geq 2$ and $0 \leq \ell \leq N-2$. The supremum in definition (2.2) for the Carleson constant $[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})]\!]$ is attained for the interval $I_{1,0}$. This gives the following formula

$$[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] = \frac{N-\ell}{2} + \frac{3}{2} - 2^{-N+\ell+1}.$$

Now we consider those dyadic trees in $\mathcal{D}_N$ that are mapped under the postorder rearrangement τ_N onto collections of disjoint dyadic intervals.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \ell \leq N$ and $0 < k \leq 2^{\ell-1}$. Then*

$$[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k})]\!] = [\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,k})]\!] = 1. \tag{4.22}$$

Proof. The idea of the proof is that for $k > 0$ there exists $s \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that the collection $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}$ is a subset of the collection of the dyadic intervals of length $s+N-\ell$.

The complete dyadic subtree $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k} = \{I_{m,r} : \ell \leq m \leq N,\, k\,2^{m-\ell} \leq r \leq (k+1)\,2^{m-\ell} - 1\}.$$

We associate the collection $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}$ with the set of postorder ordinal numbers

$$\{a^m(r) : \ell \leq m \leq N,\, k\,2^{m-\ell} \leq r \leq (k+1)\,2^{m-\ell} - 1\}. \tag{4.23}$$

By the description of the postorder rearrangement τ_N in Section 4.1, we have

$$\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}) = \{I_{L,K} :\, L = \mathrm{Level}\,(a^m(r)),\, K = \mathrm{Pos}\,(a^m(r))\}.$$

Let $s = \lceil \log_2(k+1) \rceil$. We show that for all m and r as in (4.23) we have

$$\mathrm{Level}\,(a^m(r)) = s + N - \ell.$$

Let $\overline{s} = m - \ell + \lceil \log_2(k+1) \rceil$ so that $2^{\overline{s}-1} \leq k\,2^{m-\ell}$ and $(k+1)2^{m-\ell} - 1 \leq 2^{\overline{s}} - 1$. By Lemma 4.2 it follows that for all $k\,2^{m-\ell} \leq r \leq (k+1)\,2^{m-\ell} - 1$ we have

$$\mathrm{Level}(a^m(r)) = \overline{s} + N - m = s + N - \ell.$$

The image of $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}$ is then given by

$$\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}) = \{I_{s+N-\ell,K} : K = \mathrm{Pos}\,(a^m(r))\}.$$

$\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k})$ is a collection of disjoint dyadic intervals and therefore, $[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k})]\!] = 1$. Since $\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,k} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k}$, it follows that $\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,k}) \subseteq \tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,k})$. Therefore, $\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,k})$ is also a collection of disjoint dyadic intervals with $[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,k})]\!] = 1$. □

4.3. **The proof of Theorem 3.1.** Finally, we have all ingredients that we need to prove the statement of Theorem 3.1. For convenience we recall the statement. The rearrangement operators $T = T_{\tau_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})}$ and $T = T_{\sigma_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell})}$ satisfy the following norm estimates

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(N-\ell+1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \|T\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \le (N-\ell+1)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Recall that $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}) = \operatorname{span}\{h_I : I \in \mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}\}$ and $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}) = \operatorname{span}\{h_I : I \in \mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}\}$. The proof uses the norm estimates for rearrangement operators on BMO_N given in Section 2.6 and the estimates for Carleson constants given in Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.7.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $x \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})$. The norm estimate (2.10) and the statement of Theorem 4.4 yield

$$\|T_{\tau_N} x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}} \le [\![\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})]\!]\|x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}} \le (N-\ell+1)\|x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}}.$$

This gives the upper bound

$$\Big\|T_{\tau_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})}\Big\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \le (N-\ell+1)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Equation (2.9) gives the lower bound

$$\Big\|T_{\tau_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})}\Big\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \ge \sup_{\substack{\mathcal{C}\subseteq\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0},\\ \text{non-empty}}} \frac{[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{C})]\!]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[\![\mathcal{C}]\!]^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

We consider the lowermost level $\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0}$ of the complete dyadic subtree $\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}$ in $\mathcal{D}_N$. Obviously, $\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}$. We know that $[\![\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0}]\!] = 1$. Hence, by the statement of Theorem 4.4 we have

$$\Big\|T_{\tau_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0})}\Big\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \ge [\![\tau_N(\mathcal{E}^N_{\ell,0})]\!] \ge \frac{1}{2}(N-\ell+1).$$

Let $x \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell})$. The norm estimate (2.10) yields

$$\|T_{\sigma_N} x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}} \le [\![\sigma_N(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell})]\!]\|x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}}.$$

By the proof of Theorem 4.4 it follows that $\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}) = \mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}$. Since $\sigma_N = \tau_N^{-1}$, we have $\sigma_N(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}) = \mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}$ and $[\![\sigma_N(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell})]\!] = [\![\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell,0}]\!] = N-\ell+1$. Hence,

$$\Big\|T_{\sigma_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell})}\Big\|_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \le (N-\ell+1)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Equation (2.9) gives the lower bound

$$\Big\|T_{\sigma_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell})}\Big\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \ge \sup_{\substack{\mathcal{C}\subseteq\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell},\\ \text{non-empty}}} \frac{[\![\sigma_N(\mathcal{C})]\!]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[\![\mathcal{C}]\!]^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Let $\ell < N$. The proof of Theorem 4.7 asserts that $\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell+1,1}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{N-\ell}$ and $[\![\tau_N(\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell+1,1})]\!] = 1$. Hence, we have the lower bound

$$\Big\|T_{\tau_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}_{N-\ell})}\Big\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \ge [\![\mathcal{T}^N_{\ell+1,1}]\!] = N-\ell \ge \frac{1}{2}(N-\ell+1).$$

The case $\ell = N$ is trivial. □

5. Proof of Theorem 3.2

As mentioned in Section 3, the proof of Theorem 3.2 uses a geometric representation of order intervals with respect to the postorder, $\preceq$. This geometric representation is given in Proposition 2.3 and Definition 2.2 as follows. For every postorder order interval

$$\mathcal{B}^N(I_1, I_2) = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I_1 \preceq I \preceq I_2\},$$

there exists a collection of maximal intervals $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_m\}$ such that

$$\mathcal{B}^N(I_1, I_2) = \mathcal{C}(I_1, L_1) \cup \mathcal{R}(I_1, L_1) \cup_{i=2}^{m} \mathcal{M}_i,$$

where $\mathcal{C}(I_1, L_1)$ is the cone of dyadic intervals between I_1 and L_1, $\mathcal{R}(I_1, L_1)$ is the right fill-up of the cone and $\mathcal{M}_i$ is the complete dyadic subtree with root L_i given by $\mathcal{M}_i = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I \subseteq L_i\}$.

For the norm estimate in Theorem 3.2 we need an estimate for the Carleson constant $[\![\mathcal{B}^N(I_1, I_2)]\!]$. By the geometric representation of B^N given above we have that the Carleson constant $[\![\mathcal{B}^N(I_1, I_2)]\!]$ is related to the Carleson constant of the cone and the right fill-up. Therefore, we start examining the Carleson constant $[\![\mathcal{C}(I, J) \cup \mathcal{R}(I, J)]\!]$ for two non-disjoint dyadic intervals $I, J \in \mathcal{D}_N$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $I, J \in \mathcal{D}_N$ and $I \subseteq J$. If $\mathcal{R}(I, J) \neq \emptyset$, then*

$$N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|I|} + 1 \leq [\![\mathcal{C}(I, J) \cup \mathcal{R}(I, J)]\!] \leq N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|J|} + 2. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. The definition of the Carleson constant (2.2) yields

$$[\![\mathcal{R}(I, J)]\!] \leq [\![\mathcal{C}(I, J) \cup \mathcal{R}(I, J)]\!] \leq [\![\mathcal{R}(I, J)]\!] + [\![\mathcal{C}(I, J)]\!]. \tag{5.2}$$

Recall that the cone $\mathcal{C}(I, J)$ is a collection of dyadic intervals $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$, where $n = \log_2 \frac{|J|}{|I|} + 1$, which satisfies the following properties: $C_1 = I$, $C_n = J$, $|C_i| = \frac{1}{2}|C_{i+1}|$ and $C_i \subset C_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. This yields

$$[\![\mathcal{C}(I, J)]\!] = \sup_{i=1,\dots,n} \frac{1}{|C_i|} \sum_{J \subseteq C_i,\, J \in \mathcal{C}} |J| = \sup_{i=1,\dots,n} \frac{1}{|C_i|} \sum_{s=1}^{i} |C_s|.$$

Since $|C_i| = 2^{i-1}|C_1|$, it follows that $[\![\mathcal{C}(I, J)]\!] \leq 2$.
The right fill-up $\mathcal{R}(I, J)$ of the cone is the collection of dyadic intervals $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathcal{U}_{i+1}$, where $\mathcal{U}_{i+1} = \emptyset$, if C_i is the right half of C_{i+1} and $\mathcal{U}_{i+1} = \{U \in \mathcal{D}_N : U \subseteq C_{i+1} \setminus C_i\}$, if C_i is the left half of C_{i+1}. Note that by definition $\mathcal{U}_i \cap \mathcal{U}_j = \emptyset$ for every $i \neq j$. Therefore,

$$[\![\mathcal{R}(I, J)]\!] = \sup_{i=1,\dots,n-1} [\![\mathcal{U}_{i+1}]\!]. \tag{5.3}$$

If $\mathcal{U}_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{U}_{i+1}$ is a dyadic subtree of $\mathcal{D}_N$ with root $C_{i+1} \setminus C_i$ and depth $N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|C_{i+1} \setminus C_i|}$. We know that $|C_{i+1} \setminus C_i| = |C_i|$ and $|C_i| = 2^{i-1}|I|$. Therefore, by equation (2.4) we have $[\![\mathcal{U}_{i+1}]\!] = N - \log_2 \frac{2^{1-i}}{|I|} + 1 = N + i - \log_2 \frac{1}{|I|}$. Hence, by equation (5.3)

$$N + 1 - \log_2 \frac{1}{|I|} \leq [\![\mathcal{R}(I, J)]\!] \leq N + n - 1 - \log_2 \frac{1}{|I|}.$$

Recall that $n = \log_2 \frac{|J|}{|I|} + 1$. This gives the upper bound

$$[\![\mathcal{R}(I,J)]\!] \leq N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|J|}.$$

Summarizing we have (5.1). □

The statement of Proposition 2.3 and the estimates from Theorem 5.1 yield the following estimates for the Carleson constant $[\![\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)]\!]$.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2) = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I_1 \preceq I \preceq I_2\}$, where $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{D}_N$ with $I_1 \preceq I_2$. Let L_1 be the maximal interval in the order interval $\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)$ such that $I_1 \subseteq L_1$. Then*

$$N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|I_1|} + 1 \leq [\![\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)]\!] \leq N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_1|} + 2. \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_m\}$ be the maximal (with respect to inclusion) elements of $\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)$, as given in Proposition 2.3 . Since

$$\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2) = \mathcal{C}(I_1,L_1) \cup \mathcal{R}(I_1,L_1) \cup_{i=2}^m \mathcal{M}_i,$$

where $\mathcal{M}_i = \{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I \subseteq L_i\}$, and since $\mathcal{M}_i \cap \mathcal{M}_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$ and $\mathcal{M}_i \cap (\mathcal{C}(I_1,L_1) \cup \mathcal{R}(I_1,L_1)) = \emptyset$ for all i, we have

$$[\![\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)]\!] = \max\{[\![\mathcal{C}(I_1,L_1) \cup \mathcal{R}(I_1,L_1)]\!], \max_{i=2,\dots,m} [\![\mathcal{M}_i]\!]\}. \tag{5.5}$$

If $I_1 \subseteq I_2$, then there is only one maximal interval $L_1 = I_2$. Hence, $m = 1$ and $I \in \mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)$ if and only if $I \in \mathcal{C}(I_1,I_2) \cup \mathcal{R}(I_1,I_2)$, cf. proof of Proposition 2.3 in [17]. Therefore, we have

$$[\![\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)]\!] = [\![\mathcal{C}(I_1,I_2) \cup \mathcal{R}(I_1,I_2)]\!]. \tag{5.6}$$

Theorem 5.1 yields the statement.

If $I_1 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$, then there exist maximal intervals $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, \dots, L_m\}$, $m \geq 2$. For $2 \leq i \leq m$, $\mathcal{M}_i$ is a dyadic subtree of $\mathcal{D}_N$ with root L_i and depth $N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_i|}$. Equation (2.4) yields $[\![\mathcal{M}_i]\!] = N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_i|} + 1$. Proposition 2.3 yields $|L_m| \leq |L_{m-1}| < \cdots < |L_2|$. Hence, $[\![\mathcal{M}_2]\!] = \max_{i=2,\dots,m} [\![\mathcal{M}_i]\!]$ and

$$[\![\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)]\!] = \max\{[\![\mathcal{C}(I_1,L_1) \cup \mathcal{R}(I_1,L_1)]\!], [\![\mathcal{M}_2]\!]\}.$$

Note that $[\![\mathcal{M}_2]\!] = N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_2|} + 1$. By Theorem 5.1 we have the following lower and upper bound.

$$[\![\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)]\!] \geq \max\{N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|I_1|} + 1,\ N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_2|} + 1\} \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$[\![\mathcal{B}^N(I_1,I_2)]\!] \leq \max\{N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_1|} + 2,\ N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_2|} + 1\}. \tag{5.8}$$

Inequality (5.7) gives the left-hand side of (5.4). Proposition 2.3 states that $|L_2| \leq |L_1|$. Therefore, (5.8) yields the right-hand side of (5.4). □

5.1. **The proof of Theorem 3.2.** Now we have all ingredients for the proof of Theorem 3.2. For convenience we give the statement of the Theorem. We have the following operator norm estimate for the rearrangement operator T_{σ_N} acting on lexicographic order intervals $\mathcal{E}(E_1, E_2)$ given by the endpoints $E_1, E_2 \in \mathcal{D}_N$ with $E_1 \leq_l E_2$:

$$\left\| T_{\sigma_N}\big|_{\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})} \right\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}_N} \leq N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_1|} + 2,$$

where L_1 is the maximal (with respect to inclusion) dyadic interval in the postorder order interval $B^N(\sigma_N(E_1), \sigma_N(E_2))$ that contains the left endpoint $\sigma_N(E_1)$. Recall that $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}) = \operatorname{span}\{I \in \mathcal{D}_N : I \in \mathcal{E}\}$.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let $x \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E})$. The estimates of rearrangement operators on BMO_N in Section 2.6 give the upper bound

$$\|T_{\sigma_N} x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}} \leq [\![\sigma_N(\mathcal{E})]\!] \, \|x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}}. \tag{5.9}$$

σ_N is the bijective map on $\mathcal{D}_N$ that maps lexicographic order intervals onto postorder order intervals. Hence, for every lexicographic order interval $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(E_1, E_2)$ there exists a unique postorder order interval $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}^N(\sigma_N(E_1), \sigma_N(E_2))$ so that $\sigma_N(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{B}$. Hence, by equation (5.9) and Theorem 5.2 we have

$$\|T_{\sigma_N} x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}} \leq [\![\mathcal{B}]\!] \, \|x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}} \leq (N - \log_2 \frac{1}{|L_1|} + 2) \, \|x\|^2_{\mathrm{BMO}}, \tag{5.10}$$

where L_1 is the maximal interval in $\mathcal{B}^N(\sigma_N(E_1), \sigma_N(E_2))$ with $\sigma_N(E_1) \subseteq L_1$. □

Outlook

In [13] P.F.X. Müller gives a flexible geometric condition on the rearrangement τ which describes the isomorphic properties of the rearrangement operator T_τ, see also [5]. It is an open problem to uncover an equally flexible geometric condition on τ which is connected to isometric properties of T_τ. Our present work could be interpreted as a first step towards the solution of this problem.

Acknowledgements. This paper is part of the author's PhD thesis written at the Department of Analysis, J. Kepler University Linz. This research has been supported by the Austrian Science foundation (FWF) Pr.Nr. P22549.

I thank my PhD advisor P.F.X. Müller for many helpful discussions and suggestions during the preparation of this paper.

I am grateful to G. Schechtman for information on the postorder and to M. Passenbrunner for suggestions on notation and description concerning the postorder.

References

[1] K. Berman and J. Paul. *Algorithms : sequential, parallel, and distributed.* Thomson/Course Technology, Boston, Mass, 2005.

[2] B. Cuartero and M.A. Triana. (p, q)-convexity in quasi-Banach lattices and applications. *Studia Math.*, 84(2):113–124, 1986.

[3] C. Fefferman and E.M. Stein. H^p spaces of several variables. *Acta Math.*, 129(3-4):137–193, 1972.

[4] A.M. Garsia. *Martingale inequalities: Seminar notes on recent progress.* W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, Mass.-London-Amsterdam, 1973. Mathematics Lecture Notes Series.

[5] S. Geiss and P.F.X. Müller. Extrapolation of vector-valued rerrangement operators. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 80(3):798–814, 2009.

[6] S. Geiss, P.F.X. Müller, and V. Pillwein. A remark on extrapolation of rearrangement operators on dyadic H^s, $0 < s \leq 1$. *Studia Math.*, 171(2):197–205, 2005.
[7] A. Kamont and P.F.X. Müller. Rearrangements with supporting trees, isomorphisms and shift operators. *Math. Z.*, 274(1-2):57–83, 2013.
[8] D.E. Knuth. *The art of computer programming. Vol. 1. Fasc. 1.* Addison-Wesley, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2005. MMIX, a RISC computer for the new millennium.
[9] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri. *Classical Banach spaces. II*, volume 97 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979. Function spaces.
[10] S.G. Mallat. A theory for multiresolution signal decomposition: the wavelet representation. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2(7):674–693, 1989.
[11] Y. Meyer. *Wavelets*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1993. Algorithms & applications, Translated from the French and with a foreword by Robert D. Ryan.
[12] P.F.X. Müller. On projections in H^1 and BMO. *Studia Math.*, 89(2):145–158, 1988.
[13] P.F.X. Müller. Rearrangements of the Haar system that preserve BMO. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 75(3):600–618, 1997.
[14] P.F.X. Müller. *Isomorphisms between H^1 spaces*, volume 66 of *Instytut Matematyczny Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Monografie Matematyczne (New Series) [Mathematics Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Mathematical Monographs (New Series)]*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2005.
[15] P.F.X. Müller. Extrapolation of vector-valued rearrangement operators II. *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)*, 85(3):722–736, 2012.
[16] P.F.X. Müller and J. Penteker. p-summing multiplication operators, dyadic Hardy spaces and atomic decomposition. *Houston Journal Math.*, 41(2):639–668, 2015.
[17] P.F.X. Müller and G. Schechtman. A remarkable rearrangement of the Haar system in L_p. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 125(8):2363–2371, 1997.
[18] R.E.A.C. Paley. A Remarkable Series of Orthogonal Functions (I). *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, S2-34(1):241, 1932.
[19] F. Schipp. On equivalence of rearrangements of the Haar system in dyadic Hardy and BMO spaces. *Anal. Math.*, 16(2):135–141, 1990.
[20] E.M. Semënov. Equivalence in L^p of permutations of the Haar system. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 242(6):1258–1260, 1978.
[21] E.M. Semënov and B. Stökert. Permutations of the Haar system in spaces L_p. *Anal. Math.*, 7(4):277–295, 1981.
[22] J.S. Walker. *A primer on wavelets and their scientific applications*. Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, second edition, 2008.

J. Penteker, Institute of Analysis, Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria, 4040 Linz, Altenberger Strasse 69

E-mail address: johanna.penteker@jku.at